



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	POLICY NO. 606.1	EFFECTIVE DATE 10/1/89	PAGE 1 of 7
APPROVED BY: original signed by: ROBERTO QUIROZ Director	SUPERSEDES 712 3/22/88	ORIGINAL ISSUE DATE 3/22/88	DISTRIBUTION LEVEL(S) 1

PURPOSE

- 1.1 To provide policy and guidelines regarding performance evaluations for Department of Mental Health (DMH) employees.

DEFINITION

- 2.1 A performance evaluation is management's assessment of an employee's performance in relation to the requirements of the position the employee holds. It is a continuing day-to-day responsibility of supervision to evaluate the employee's performance in preparation for reporting to management. Performance evaluations can serve as an effective management tool for increased productivity and supervision and to help ensure that the goals and objectives of the Department are met.

POLICY

- 3.1 In order to achieve an effective use of performance evaluations and to meet the intent of Civil Service Rules and County Ordinance, the following Departmental policies and procedures are adopted for evaluations not issued as part of the County's Performance-Based Pay Plan.
- 3.2 Los Angeles County Civil Service Rules require that all employees be formally evaluated at least once a year. Probationers also must be evaluated by the end of the probationary period.
- 3.3 In addition, County Ordinance and Memoranda of Understanding require that an evaluation of "Competent" or better be on file within the previous 12 months before an employee may receive any annual step increase. In determining an employee's Appraisal of Promotability score in promotional examinations, performance evaluations help serve as a projection of how the employee would perform in the higher level position.
- 3.4 In view of the impact that performance evaluations have on both the employee and Departmental operations, the need for timely and accurate evaluations cannot be overemphasized. Both the employee's immediate supervisor and Program Head or District/Division Chief have responsibility to ensure the timeliness and appropriateness of any performance evaluation that is due.



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT: PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	POLICY NO. 606.1	EFFECTIVE DATE 10/1/89	PAGE 2 of 7
--	----------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

- 3.5 For overall "Improvement Needed" ratings and "Unsatisfactory" ratings, the Personnel Bureau shall also ensure the propriety of such ratings and take appropriate measures as required by Civil Service Rules and Departmental policy.

3.6 Evaluations More Often Than Once A Year

Performance evaluations may be issued more often than once a year. Rating periods for such evaluations shall not overlap and should be contiguous (except as a rating period may overlap a rating period for a Report on Probationer).

3.7 Leaves During Rating Periods

When an employee's leave of absence is of such length during the rating period that a proper assessment of the employee's performance in any factor cannot be made, the rater may note that fact in the Comments section of the evaluation and identify the period of the employee's leave. The overall rating may then be left blank and no ratings entered in any of the factors or items. In these cases, such evaluations result in the employee being deemed competent for the rating period.

RATINGS

- 4.1 There are five overall ratings that are used by the County for employees not under the Performance-Based Pay Plan.

- 4.2 Performance evaluations are not to be issued with an "administrative competent" rating under any circumstances. Each performance evaluation issued shall properly document one of the five overall ratings identified below:

4.2.1 Outstanding

All work performance is consistently above the standards of the position. A substantial part of the work performance exceeds supervisory and management expectations most of the time. Factual evidence must be presented in the Comments section of the evaluation to substantiate the rating.

4.2.2 Very Good

A substantial part of the work performance is well above the standards of performance required for the position, and all other parts of the performance are at least competent. Factual evidence must be presented in the Comments section of the evaluation to substantiate the rating.



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT: PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	POLICY NO. 606.1	EFFECTIVE DATE 10/1/89	PAGE 3 of 7
--	----------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

4.2.3 Competent

The work performance is consistently up to or somewhat above the requirements of the position. This is the performance that is expected of a trained and qualified employee.

4.2.4 Improvement Needed

This rating indicates that (1) a significant part of the work performance is below the standards of performance required for the position and (2) it is reasonable to expect that the employee will bring the performance up to acceptable standards.

4.2.4.1 A Plan for Improvement must be incorporated with an evaluation rating an employee overall "Improvement Needed." Factual evidence must be presented in the Comments section of the evaluation to substantiate this rating. Part of that substantiation is documentation that the employee was clearly informed of the deficiencies, what must be done to correct them, and that supervision/management has made reasonable efforts to assist the employee. It is not necessary to attach copies of conference memos, warnings, etc. to the evaluation as long as the Comments section documents the incidents, problems, and/or disciplinary actions.

4.2.4.2 Whenever this rating is given, a subsequent evaluation must be made within a six-month period unless the "Improvement Needed" follow-up period has been extended under provisions of Civil Service Rule 20. It is not necessary in all circumstances for the entire six-month period to elapse before a final rating is issued.

4.2.4.3 The subsequent evaluation must either rate the employee overall "Unsatisfactory" or overall "Competent." Except when the follow-up period has been extended pursuant to Rule 20, if no final evaluation is submitted by the end of the six-month period, the employee reverts to his/her immediate prior status. The date that the employee is given or mailed the "Improvement Needed" rating begins the follow-up period.

4.2.4.4 Managers at the level of Program Head or above wishing to consider rating an employee overall "Improvement Needed" must contact the Head of Technical Services, Personnel Bureau, for assistance as soon as possible, but not later than 60 days prior to the due date of the evaluation or anticipated issuance of such rating.

4.2.4.5 In those circumstance where a follow-up period needs to be extended as a result of an employee's absence from duties, the Program Head or



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT: PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	POLICY NO. 606.1	EFFECTIVE DATE 10/1/89	PAGE 4 of 7
--	----------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

District/Division Chief must contact the Personnel Bureau as soon as possible but not later than 30 days prior to the end of the period.

4.2.5 Unsatisfactory

A substantial part of the work performance is inadequate and definitely inferior to the standards of performance required for the position; or when it can be reasonably anticipated that formally rating the employee "Improvement Needed" would not correct the deficiencies; or when the employee has failed to improve his/her performance in factors previously rated "Improvement Needed." Factual evidence must be presented in writing to substantiate this rating. It is not necessary to attach various memos to the evaluation as long as the Comments section documents the incidents, problems, and/or disciplinary actions.

- 4.2.5.1 When this rating is given, it must be accompanied by a discharge or reduction in those cases in which the employee is still in service.
- 4.2.5.2 Managers at the level of Program Head or above wishing to consider rating an employee overall "Unsatisfactory" must contact the Head of Technical Services, Personnel Bureau, for assistance as soon as possible but not later than 60 days prior to the due date of the evaluation.

4.3 Supporting Documentation

It is not necessary to attach supporting documentation to the evaluation as long as the Comments section substantiates the factor and overall ratings. However, the supporting documentation should be maintained by the rater.

PERSONS AUTHORIZED TO SIGN AS "REPORTING OFFICERS"

5.1 Rater

Normally the employee's immediate supervisor will also be the rater.

5.2 Reviewer

- 5.2.1 The reviewing officer for "Competent" ratings should be the supervisor or manager, within the employee's chain of command, immediately above the rater. In many Departmental operations, it will be the Program Head.
- 5.2.2 For all other ratings, the reviewing officer should be the individual designated by the chart in Section 5.4.



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT: PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	POLICY NO. 606.1	EFFECTIVE DATE 10/1/89	PAGE 5 of 7
--	----------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

5.3 Department Head

- 5.3.1 For overall ratings of "Outstanding," the Director of Mental Health may delegate to the appropriate executive staff member the authority to approve such ratings within their operations and to sign the evaluations in the Director's behalf.
- 5.3.2 For overall ratings of "Very Good," the Deputy Director is authorized to sign such evaluations as Department Head.
- 5.3.3 For overall "Competent" ratings, the District or Division Chief is authorized to sign as Department Head.
- 5.3.4 For overall ratings of "Improvement Needed" and "Unsatisfactory," the Personnel Officer, or designee, is authorized to sign as the Department Head.

5.4 Overall Rating _____	Review Level _____	Department Head _____
Outstanding	Deputy Director	Chief Deputy Director Assistant Director Medical Director
Very Good	District/Division Chief	Deputy Director
Competent	Program Head	District/Division Chief
Improvement Needed	District/Division Chief	Personnel Officer/Designee
Unsatisfactory	District/Division Chief	Personnel Officer/Designee

- 5.4.1 In those circumstances where the rater is also authorized to sign the evaluation as reviewer or Department Head, the reviewing officer's signature is not necessary, and the next level of management may sign as the Department Head.

PROCEDURE

- 6.1 Personnel Bureau will send an employee's due Performance Evaluation to the employee's pay location approximately one month prior to the end of the rating period (except for the evaluation following an overall "Improvement Needed" rating).



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT: PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	POLICY NO. 606.1	EFFECTIVE DATE 10/1/89	PAGE 6 of 7
--	----------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

- 6.2 The evaluation is to be prepared by the employee's immediate supervisor (rater). If the employee had more than one supervisor during the rating period, the current supervisor is responsible for obtaining input from the prior supervision.
- 6.3 The rater prepares a draft of the evaluation for discussion with his/her immediate supervisor; the rater finalizes the draft and obtains the appropriate signatures.
- 6.4 Reviewing levels will need to approve and sign the final evaluation before it is presented to the employee.
- 6.5 The rater meets with the employee to review the evaluation, discuss the employee's performance strengths and weaknesses, and review other job-related matters.
- 6.6 The employee signs the evaluation as reflecting that it was discussed with him/her. The employee's signature on the evaluation does not constitute agreement with any rating or comment. If the employee declines to sign the evaluation, the rater is to note that fact on the evaluation and, if possible, have the refusal witnessed.
- 6.7 If the employee is unavailable for the meeting because he/she is on leave of absence or has left DMH service, the rater shall enter "Unavailable for Signature" in the space provided for the employee's signature. If the employee has been reassigned to another section of the Department and is not on leave, the employee is considered available.
- 6.8 The completed evaluation is distributed and marked accordingly by the employee's office.
- 6.9 Within 20 calendar days of the date the evaluation is presented to the employee for signature, the employee is to receive his/her copy. If the evaluation is mailed to the employee, the date of mailing and address to where it was mailed are entered in the appropriate box.
- 6.10 If the evaluation is hand-served to the employee, the date of service is entered in the appropriate box.
- 6.11 The copies of the completed and signed evaluation are distributed as follows:
- 6.11.1 Original copy – Official Personnel Folder
- 6.11.1.1 Under provisions of the various Memoranda of Understanding, Personnel Files article, documents such as performance evaluations may not be filed in an employee's personnel folder until the time within which the employee may file a grievance has expired or until the completion of any grievance. The employee's office should establish a control for ten business days from the date the employee is handed or mailed his/her



DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH POLICY/PROCEDURE

SUBJECT: PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	POLICY NO. 606.1	EFFECTIVE DATE 10/1/89	PAGE 7 of 7
--	----------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

copy of the evaluation with a rating of "Competent" or better before it is filed in the Personnel Folder.

- 6.11.1.2 If no grievance is filed by the control date, the original is sent to the Performance Evaluation Clerk, Personnel Bureau, for filing in the Official Personnel Folder.
- 6.11.1.3 If a grievance is filed, the office keeps the original until resolution through the grievance procedure. The Personnel Bureau should be notified of the grievance.
- 6.11.1.4 For overall ratings of "Unsatisfactory" and "Improvement Needed," the Personnel Bureau will ensure that the evaluation is filed in the Official Personnel Folder at the appropriate time.

6.11.2 First copy – Office records

Filing subject to the 10-business-day control for grievances.

6.11.3 Second copy – Employee

6.12 Managers at the level of Program Head or above who have specific questions about this policy or about evaluations for individual employees should contact the Head of Technical Services, Personnel Bureau.

AUTHORITY

Civil Service Rules
Memoranda of Understanding